



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,194	06/27/2001	Pradeep Kumar Subrahmanyan	1934.105US1	3918
7590 04/27/2004			EXAMINER	
Derek J. Berger Seagate Technology LLC Intellectual Property Dept. COL2LGL 389 Disc Drive			CAO, ALLEN T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2652	
Longmont, CO 80503			DATE MAILED: 04/27/2004	. /1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisom Action	09/893,194	SUBRAHMANYAN, PRADEEP			
Advisory Action	Examiner	KUMAR Art Unit			
_	Allen T Cao	2652			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe					
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which I (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely	ALLOWANCE. Ition. A proper reply to a			
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin In FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP			
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offifiled, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.7	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.			
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	r reconsideration has been cons e Continuation Sheet.	idered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly			
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to: 16.					
Claim(s) rejected: 1-15 and 17-30.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449)	· .			
10. Other:	٠	Menten			

Allen Cao Primary Examiner Continuation of 2. NOTE: claim 1, lines 3, 5-6 and 10-11; claim 5, lines 3-4 raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the proposed amendment will not be entered (see NOTE) and the final rejection stands.

Applicant asserts that changing the phrase "disc drive" to "information handling device" is not necessitated the new ground of the rejection. However, the Examiner respectfully points out that changing the phrase "disc drive" (which is reffered to a disc drive technology only) to "information handling device (broaden the scope of the claim which can be reffered to any device); therefore, the Examiner maitains that the amendment was necessitated the new gound of the rejection, thus the final Office Action is proper.